

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION

JESSICA HODGES, and ESTATE)
OF LEE MICHAEL CREELY,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) CV422-067
)
WARDEN BROOKS L. BENTON,)
et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

ORDER

Following a discovery hearing, the Court authorized Plaintiffs to file any motions to compel discussed at the hearing. Doc. 71 (Minute Entry). Plaintiffs subsequently submitted a series of improper and confusing filings which have complicated the docket.¹ Plaintiffs' filings led Defendant Chatham County, Georgia (the "County") to file two motions. Docs. 80 & 81. The Court finds that the pending requests

¹ See, e.g., doc. 73 (Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel); doc. 74 (Plaintiffs' second Motion to Compel); doc. 75 (Plaintiffs' filing styled as an "ex parte" motion to "substitute" doc. 74 with a "corrected [m]otion"); doc. 78 (Plaintiffs explain that the filing at doc. 75 was "improperly titled 'Ex Parte.' "); doc. 77 (Plaintiffs request to "substitute" a "corrected" Motion to Compel, explaining that they "erred and filed the wrong brief"); see also doc. 76 (Order that Plaintiffs show cause why the filing styled as "ex parte" should not be placed on the open docket).

cannot be efficiently resolved without a status conference. Accordingly, all pending motions filed after the Court's discovery hearing, doc. 71, are **TERMINATED** pending a status conference. Docs. 73, 74, 75, 77, 80 & 81; *see Vibe Micro, Inc. v. Shabanets*, 878 F.3d 1291, 1295 (11th Cir. 2018) (“A district court has the inherent authority to control its docket and ensure the prompt resolution of lawsuits” (quotations and citation omitted)). The Court will set the conference by separate Order. To avoid further confusion, the parties are **DIRECTED** that they shall not respond or reply to the motions currently pending on the docket at entries 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, or 81, until further direction of the Court.

The County has filed a motion indicating that Plaintiffs filed two documents as exhibits on the open docket which are “the subject of the motion to compel, as they are the documents being presented for ex parte review by [the Court].” Doc. 80 at 2 (citing docs 77-5 & 77-6). The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to maintain those two documents under seal, docs. 77-5 & 77-6, until further Order from the Court.

SO ORDERED, this 20th day of January, 2023.



CHRISTOPHER L. RAY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA